



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/923,969	08/08/2001	Shell S. Simpson	10008204-1	2101

7590

08/09/2005

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY

Intellectual Property Administration

P.O. Box 272400

Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

ANYA, CHARLES E

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2194

DATE MAILED: 08/09/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/923,969

Applicant(s)

SIMPSON ET AL.

Examiner

Charles E. Anya

Art Unit

2194

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 5/23/05.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 4-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 4-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

20

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1 and 4-21 are pending in this application.

Claim Objections

2. Claim 21 is objected to because of the following informalities:

Claim 21 appears to include a typographical error on line 3. Specifically the term "cabable" seems to have been used in error.

For the purpose of this office action the Examiner would change the term "cabable" to "capable".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. **Claims 5,9,13,19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.**

The following terms lacks antecedent basis:

- i. "the user" on line 2 of claim 5.

For the purpose of this office action the Examiner would change the term "the user" to "a user".

- ii. "the rules" on line 1 of claim 9.

For the purpose of this office action the Examiner would change the term "the rule" to "the plurality of rules".

- iii. "the user's browser" on line 2 of claim 13.

For the purpose of this office action the Examiner would change the term "the user's browser" to "a user's browser".

- iv. "wherein the determining step" on line 1 of claims 19 and 20.

For the purpose of this office action the Examiner would change the term "wherein the determining step" to "further".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. **Claims 1 and 4-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 6,623,527 B1 to Hamzy in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,529,943 B1 to Ohi.**

7. As to claim 1, Hamzy teaches a client configurable web based imaging page redirector system comprising: at least one processor at a client programmed with client software for receiving content from an imaging source at an external web site, wherein

the content includes a designator to take a processing action with respect to at least a portion of the content (Steps 205/207 Col. 5 Ln. 22 – 39, Col. 6 Ln. 1 – 2); the redirector software being executed to access the programmatic interface to obtain the information (“...user profile...” Col. 5 Ln. 9 – 67); the redirector software changing at least one designator to be displayed based on the information (Step 207 Col. 6 Ln. 1 – 2); and software for initiating a display of the changed at least one designator (“...present...” Col. 6 Ln. 3 – 6).

8. Hamzy is silent with reference to redirector software loaded in the client that uses a programmatic interface to obtain information.

9. Ohi teaches redirector software loaded in the client that uses a programmatic interface to obtain information (Steps S1301/S1302 Col. 12 Ln. 52 – 61).

10. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Ohi and Hamzy because the teaching of Ohi would improve the system of Hamzy by providing a service to a client by a server in a client and server system by publishing part of its information and functionality to the client so that the client can create a request for a service based on the published information and so that the server can safely execute the request (Ohi Col. 3 Ln. 1 – 6).

11. As to claim 4, Hamzy teaches the system as defined in claim 1, wherein the client software is a printer driver (Col. 5 Ln. 9 – 11).

Art Unit: 2194

12. As to claim 5, Hamzy teaches the system as defined in claim 1, wherein the programmatic interface comprises: a configuration page, displaying to the user a set of web page or web based imaging service options; receiving a selection of one of the options from the user; and storing a reference to the selected option (Col. 5 Ln. 49 – 55).

13. As to claim 6, Hamzy teaches the system as defined in claim 1, wherein the programmatic interface includes code which looks for a cookie or other storage on a user's system that identifies the at least one designator ("...user profile..." Col. 5 Ln. 60 – 63).

14. As to claim 7, Hamzy teaches the system as defined in claim 1, wherein the redirector software includes code that calls an API method for obtaining the at least one designator (Col. 5 Ln. 9 – 67).

15. As to claim 8, Hamzy teaches the system as defined in claim 1, wherein the redirector software includes code to select a destination reference based on a plurality of rules (Col. 5 Ln. 52 – 56).

16. As to claim 9, Hamzy teaches the system as defined in claim 8, wherein the rules include at least a first rule that provides at least one first designator if a user's system is

Art Unit: 2194

inside of a firewall, and a second rule that provides at least one second designator if the user's system is outside of the firewall (Col. 5 Ln. 52 – 56, Col. 6 Ln. 34 – 39).

17. As to claim 10, the system as defined in claim 5, wherein the configuration page includes a hierarchy of designators and further comprises code for automatically selecting the at least one designator according to the hierarchy based on a rule of availability (“...lists...” Col. 5 Ln. 60 – 67).

18. As to claim 11, Hamzy teaches the system as defined in claim 1, wherein the redirector software selects a local service to access based on a location of a user's system, and accesses that service to determine the availability of a local image processor service (Col. 5 Ln. 49 – 59).

19. As to claim 12, Hamzy reaches the system as defined in claim 11, wherein the redirector software selects at least one designator based on a first rule that if a local printer service is available, then selecting the at least one designator for that local printer service, and a second rule that if no local printer service is available, then selecting a default at least one designator (Col. 7 Ln. 1 – 36: NOTE: Although a default selection is not specifically disclosed in Hamzy one of ordinary of skill could implement the cited passage such that a default option is provided).

Art Unit: 2194

20. As to claim 13, Hamzy teaches the system as defined in claim 1, wherein the information obtained by the programmatic interface causes the user's browser to browse to a web site to obtain the at least one designator (Col. 5 Ln. 60 – 67).

21. As to claim 14, Hamzy teaches the system as defined in claim 1, wherein the client software uploads the content to a personal imaging repository (Col. 6 Ln. 26 – 34).

22. As to claims 15,16-19 and 20, see the rejection of claims 1,5-8 and 10 respectively.

Response to Arguments

23. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 and 4-21 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

24. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0161830 A1 to Mukaiyama et al.: directed to print portal system that intermediates between multiple content providers servers and multiple printing apparatuses.

Art Unit: 2194


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Charles E. Anya whose telephone number is (571) 272-3757. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:30-6:00) First Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, An Meng-Ai can be reached on (571) 272-3756. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Charles E Anya
Examiner
Art Unit 2194

cea.


MENG-AL T. AN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100